

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated April 27, 2010, and in response to the Request for Continued Examination file herewith, Applicant has amended claims 8 and 16. Claims 8-12 and 15-19 are pending.

In paragraph 3 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 8-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Day in view of Chowdhury, DeMoney, Katinsky, Duso and Ullman.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 8 sets forth provider equipment that includes a session manager, coupled through a communication network to said subscriber equipment, for interacting with said subscriber equipment and maintaining a plurality of playlists created by subscribers in the information distribution system coupled to the provider equipment, wherein each playlist is associated with a respective subscriber and is created and controlled at said session manager by said subscriber using commands provided to the subscriber equipment by said subscriber, said subscriber equipment being in communication with said session manager to provide said commands to said session manager, said playlist defining a plurality of content streams to be provided to subscriber equipment of the subscriber associated with the playlist and identifying a location of content streams defined in the playlist and a location of auxiliary streams associated therewith, said auxiliary streams further including reverse and fast-forward streams associated with each one of said plurality of content streams defined in said playlist created by said subscriber, each content stream comprising a plurality of splicing entry and exit points dispersed therein to enable transitioning between said plurality of content

streams, wherein said splicing entry and exit points are identified within transport packet headers of each one of said plurality of content streams, a server, coupled to the session manager, for storing said plurality of content streams at locations identified in the playlists, wherein said plurality of content streams are configured to facilitate inter-asset transition to provide seamless splicing and a server controller, coupled to the server and session manager, for retrieving from said server, content streams defined by said playlist, said content streams being sequentially provided to said subscriber equipment according to said playlist created by said subscriber and in response to commands from said subscriber to play content streams associated with said playlist, wherein a copy of said playlist is remotely coupled within said information distribution system to the session manager, said server controller, in response to determining that a remaining portion of a current content stream provided to said subscriber equipment is below a threshold, communicating a termination notification to said session manager, said session manager, in response to receiving said termination notification, communicating a request to said server controller identifying from said playlist a next content stream to be provided to said subscriber equipment from the server, said session manager further maintaining said playlist after content streams defined by said playlist have been provided to said subscriber equipment and modifying said playlist and said copy of playlist in response to playlist modification commands received from said subscriber equipment in response to input from the subscriber, wherein a next content stream in said playlist is spliced at an entry point associated with an exit point of a

current content stream being provided to said subscriber equipment. Independent claim 16 sets forth similar elements.

Day fails to disclose, teach or suggest a session manager maintaining a playlist after content streams defined by said playlist have been provided to said subscriber equipment. Rather, Day discloses that a playlist is created by the control server 211. Multimedia segments are concatenated for sequential transfer. Operating characteristics of the first and second multimedia segments are communized prior to being transferred. Thereafter, a playlist of segments to be transferred to said target device is prepared. Thus, according to Day, a playlist has to be created each session with the client. The playlist disclosed by Day is only maintain for the current session with the client and is not maintained after content streams defined by the playlist have been provided to the client.

Day fails to disclose, teach or suggest a copy of said playlist is remotely coupled within said information distribution system to the session manager and that the copy of the playlist is updated and maintained after the session with the client. Day only disclose a single session playlist being created. Day does not create a copy of the playlist and does not maintain a copy of the playlist after the session has ended.

Thus, Day fails to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as defined in independent claims 8 and 16.

Chowdhury fails to overcome the deficiencies of Day. The Final Office Action cites Chowdhury as disclosing a server controller communicating a termination notification to said session manager.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Chowdhury fails to disclose, teach or suggest a session manager maintaining a playlist after content streams defined by said

playlist have been provided to said subscriber equipment. Chowdhury discloses that a playlist is discarded when the playlist is closed.

Chowdhury fails to disclose, teach or suggest a copy of said playlist is remotely coupled within said information distribution system to the session manager and that the copy of the playlist is updated and maintained after the session with the client.

Chowdhury only disclose a single playlist being created. Chowdhury does not create a copy of the playlist and does not maintain a copy of the playlist after the session has ended.

Thus, Day and Chowdhury, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as defined in independent claims 8 and 16.

Duso fails to overcome the deficiencies of Day and Chowdhury. Duso is merely cited as disclosing the step of identifying the next segment when prefetching the track from playlist. However, Duso fails to disclose, teach or suggest a session manager maintaining a playlist after content streams defined by said playlist have been provided to said subscriber equipment. Duso also discloses that playlist data is discarded when the a clip has finished playing,

Duso also fails to disclose, teach or suggest a copy of said playlist is remotely coupled within said information distribution system to the session manager and that the copy of the playlist is updated and maintained after the session with the client. Duso only disclose a single playlist being created. Duso does not create a copy of the playlist and does not maintain a copy of the playlist after the session has ended.

Thus, Day, Chowdhury and Duso, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as defined in independent claims 8 and 16.

DeMoney, Katinsky and Ullman fail to overcome the deficiencies of Day, Chowdhury and Duso. DeMoney is merely cited as disclosing implementing VCR style functions. However, Demoney fails to suggest the elements discussed above with regard to Day, Chowdhury and Duso.

Katinsky is cited as disclosing using a media player interface to modify a playlist by adding or deleting content streams. Katinsky also discloses that a client maintains a database, wherein different playlists may be maintained.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Katinsky fails to suggest a session manager maintaining a playlist after content streams defined by said playlist have been provided to said subscriber equipment. Rather, Katinsky discloses that playlist data is created and maintained by the client.

Katinsky also fails to disclose, teach or suggest a copy of said playlist is remotely coupled within said information distribution system to the session manager and that the copy of the playlist is updated and maintained after the session with the client. Katinsky only discloses that the database may include multiple playlist. However, Katinsky does not suggest that any of the playlists are duplicates. Moreover, Katinsky fails to suggest that a copy of a playlist is remotely coupled within an information distribution system to a session manager. Katinsky only discloses that playlist data is created and maintained by the client.

Ullman merely discloses that a playlists for content to be presented to students is created by a teacher and the playlist may be saved at a server. Thus, Ullman fails to disclose a playlist as recited in claim 8 and 16. Ullman fails to suggest a playlist that is created and controlled at a session manager by a subscriber using commands provided to

the subscriber equipment by the subscriber, wherein the playlist is associated with the subscriber equipment.

Ullman further fails to disclose, teach or suggest a copy of said playlist is remotely coupled within said information distribution system to the session manager and that the copy of the playlist is updated and maintained after the session with the client. Ullman does not create a copy of a playlist.

Thus, Day, Chowdhury, Duso, DeMoney, Katinsky and Ullman, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the invention as defined in independent claims 8 and 16.

Dependent claims 9-12, 15 and 17-19 are also patentable over the references, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims 8 and 16, respectively. Further dependent claims 9-12, 15 and 17-19 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicant reserves the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 9-12, 15 and 17-19 are patentable over the cited references.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 865-380-5976. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725 for any additional fee required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(865) 380-5976

94140

Respectfully submitted,



By: _____

Name: David W. Lynch

Reg. No.: 36,204